

## THREEMILE RESTORATION AND RESILIENCY PROJECT EDITS/CORRECTIONS

### Corrections/Edits Made

Inserted clarifications/edits in Wildlife section

NB - no changes in Table 12.

In Table 13 in the EA (Table 3 in Wildlife Report) Clarifying language in the Description of Effects on Habitat or Species in Tables 3-6 for:

Bald Eagle; Blue-gray Gnatcatcher (including spelling of gnatcatcher); Burrowing Owl; Greater Sage-Grouse; Long Billed Curlew; Black-tailed Prairie Dog; Bighorn Sheep; Gray Wolf; Greater Short-horned Lizard; Milk Snake; and Western Hognose Snake.

In Table 13 (EA) (Table 3 WL Report) for Bald Eagle, changed the Determination of Effects from NI - No Impact to MIIH - May impact individuals, but is not likely to cause a trend to Federal listing or loss of viability.

NB – no changes in Table 14 (EA) (Table 4, WL Report) – Habitat Indicator and Key Species of Interest considered

In Table 15 in the EA (Table 5 in WL Report). Clarifying language in the Description of Effects on Habitat or Species for:

Green-tailed Towhee.

In Table 15 in the EA (Table 5 in WL Report). Added footnote 6: Y- Observed in project area, P- Potentially present; no recorded observations in project area but present nearby or on the District, N- Not present

In Table 16 (EA) or Table 6 in WL Report, added footnote 8: Y- Observed in project area, P- Potentially present; no recorded observations in project area but present nearby or on the District, N- Not present

P. 65 in EA, corrected reference to See Tables 1-6 in the Wildlife Report to See Tables 2-6 in the Wildlife Report.

P. 16 in WL Report, under Management Area D emphasis species for Ashland, deleted turkey and whitetail deer. Whitetail deer are a forest-wide habitat indicator species (management indicator species) at p. 18 in the Forest Plan, and turkey are not an emphasis species on Ashland in Management Area D (p. 53).

p. 17, WL Report, 3<sup>rd</sup> paragraph, 4<sup>th</sup> sentence, deleted ESP and inserted Threemile. Same paragraph 5<sup>th</sup> sentence, inserted period after detail and deleted In this FEIS.

Potential effects of each alternative on these species and/or their habitats are analyzed in detail due to known presence of individuals or habitat in the Threemile area. These species/habitats are summarized in Table 3.14.1, and evaluated in detail.

WL Report, p. 20, first partial sentence, added a comma between Custer County and South Dakota; added a comma after South Dakota, deleted the word “and”, inserted a comma after Wyoming, and inserted “and Mercer County, North Dakota.”

WL Report at p. 25, changed title of table labeled as Figure 2 Diversity of PFA/foraging vegetation compared to range of studies reported by Brewer et al. 2009, to Table 7. Diversity of PFA/foraging vegetation compared to range of studies reported by Brewer et al. 2009, and moved the title to the top of the table.

Combined the two tables in the WL report into one table, a new table 8 with a column for No Action. The title of the new table is: Table 8. PFA components for the known goshawk nest stand, each action alternative and No Action. Inserted that table into the EA at p. 67, which is Table 17 in the EA.

WL: Report at p. 27 in the first paragraph, fourth sentence, Existing Condition section. Inserted ...and is dispersed across the district. after ponderosa pine.

WL: Report at p. 28 (and EA at 68) in the Conclusion paragraph in the goshawk section, inserted at the end of the 5<sup>th</sup> sentence “while utilizing the presence of ridges and draws to reduce disturbance.” In EA at p. 68, changed reference to p. 27 from p. 28.

In WL Report, starting at p. 27. In the first paragraph in the Existing Condition for Big Game, 4<sup>th</sup> sentence, inserted “...and is dispersed across the district.” At p. 28, same paragraph, 5<sup>th</sup> sentence inserted period after thermal.” and deleted “...cover (Ashland Ranger District Deer Guidelines, 1990).” And added “Mule deer are found across the district during winter months preferring openings opposed to cover. While winter ranges were delineated in the Ashland Deer Guidelines, the reliance of these areas are based on topography cover (Ashland Ranger District Deer Guidelines, 1990).” ...Mule deer populations...

WL Report, p. 29, incomplete first paragraph, 3rd sentence, delete MDFWP within the parentheses and, correct spelling of ...Service ...).

WL Report, p. 29, incomplete first paragraph, last sentence, add sentence at end of paragraph “Given the consistency of indicators, elk framework was chosen as the guiding document since it was more recently developed and was able to consider changed conditions and more recent science.”

WL Report, p. 29, second paragraph, last sentence add “(1991). Hillis does add additional caution that strict adherence to the guidelines should be avoided. The Elk Framework expands upon this statement recommending that knowledge of local conditions and elk use patters should be taken into consideration and local biologists should be consulted to best understand the impacts to security habitat (MTFWP and USDA 2013).”

WL Report, p. 29, last paragraph, last sentence, insert at end of sentence the reference to (MTFWP and USDA, 2013).

WL Report, p. 30, third paragraph, 3<sup>rd</sup> sentence, insert at the end of sentence the reference “...(Devore, 2018).

WL Report, p. 30, third paragraph (first paragraph in the Affected Environment section) add as the last sentence to the paragraph “While security habitat may be altered within the project area, there is enough secure area across the district to provide for big game (DeVore, 2018).”

WL Report at p.30, Table 9 was Table 8. And it shows the amount of secure and non-secure habitat across the Ashland Ranger District and in the Threemile Project area, before and during Alternative A and B and after action Alternatives

WL Report at p. 31, labeled untitled table as Table 10 that shows habitat effectiveness determined by road density in acres and percentages of area within the District and Threemile project area for all alternatives.

WL Report, p. 31, second paragraph, insert after 4<sup>th</sup> sentence the next three sentences “Additional cover in the form of juniper trees is dispersed throughout the district and project area. While this habitat cannot effectively be quantified, junipers exist both in timbered and non-timbered stands. These dense trees provide thermal and visual cover year round for all species of big game.”

WL Report, p. 31, second paragraph, in sentence ending with (Ryan DeVore Pers. Comm. add “2018). Then add the following sentence “Openings on south slopes provide both forage and thermal radiation during the winter months, especially for mule deer, and are more important to this species than cover (DeVore, 2018).”

WL Report at p.31, labeled untitled table as Table 11 that shows affected, existing, not potential cover, and other cover for big game in the District and Threemile project area separated by season of use.

WL Report, p. 32, second paragraph under Environmental Effects” section delete the “s” in Alternatives, making it singular.

WL Report, p. 33, first incomplete paragraph, insert the following sentence before the last sentence “Prescribed burning will remove junipers from treated stands but these trees are not expected to be impacted by harvest treatments.”

WL Report, p. 33, third paragraph, add the following sentence as the last sentence in that paragraph “However, additional junipers may be retained by the reduced acres of prescribed burning.”

EA, p. 69; WL Report, p. 33, first paragraph below Figure 5 (EA) add the next two sentences “This mitigation is expected to reduce impacts to game from road use by reducing visibility of game to hunters and reducing sound impacts from vehicle traffic increasing the amount of habitat that can be used without disturbance (Montgomery et. Al, 2013). While 75’ may not provide

screening cover in all areas, visual and picture surveys indicate that in many instances it will adequately screen an elk.”

EA, p. 70; WL Report p. 34, in the paragraph in the Conclusion section, second sentence, insert after closed “after project completion.”

WL Report p. 38 deleted bulleted item: Mitigation buffers for known active golden eagle and prairie falcon nests are depicted in Figure 3.3.6 in the wildlife analysis in Chapter 3 (page 3.119), as it does not apply. Mitigation for golden eagle nests is described on p. 37 in the WL report.

Wildlife Report, Literature Cited, pp. 38 – 39, added the following references:

DeVore. R. (2018 January 30) Meeting with L. Dombro.

Hillis, J. M., Thompson, M. J., Canfield, J. E., Lyon, L. J., Marcum, C. L., Dolan, P.M., and D. W. McCleerey. 1991. Defining elk security: The Hillis paradigm. Pages. 38-54. A.G. Christensen, L. J. Lyonand, T. N. Lonner. Comps., Proc. Elk Vulnerability Symposium, Montana State University, Bozeman, MT. 330 pp.

Montgomery, R. A., G. J. Roloff, and J. J. Millspaugh. 2013. Variation in Elk Response to Roads by Season, Sex, and Road Type. The Journal of Wildlife Management 77(2):313-325.

In the Salafsky reference, added the word “The” before Journal of Wildlife Management 71:2274–2283.

Salafsky, S.R., R.T. Reynolds, B.R. Noon, and J.A. Wiens. 2006. Reproductive responses of northern goshawks to variable prey populations. The Journal of Wildlife Management 71:2274–2283.

USDA. 1990. Ashland Ranger District Custer National Forest Deer Guidelines. USDA Forest Service Northern Region, Missoula Montana.

USDA. 2013. Custer, Helena, Gallatin and Lewis and Clark National Forests: Framework for Project Level Effects Analysis on Elk. USDA Forest Service Northern Region, Missoula, Montana.

EA at p. 116, added a paragraph describing the effects of no action to recreation and scenery.